REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 14-19, 21-22 and 24 are pending. Reconsideration of presently pending claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 14-19, 21-22 and 24 is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-12 and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.2003/0233290 hereinafter referred to as "Yang") in view of Hagen, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,287 hereinafter referred to as "Hagen"). Claims 21-22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Hagen in further view of Arackaparambil, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156548 hereinafter referred to as "Arackaparambil"). Applicant traverses these rejections on the grounds that the references are defective in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the listed claims.

Each of independent claims 1, 6, and 21 recite, "an abnormality alert." Such feature is not taught by the cited combination of references. The rejection does not rely on Hagen or Arackaparambil to teach such feature, but instead points to Yang at paragraphs 0009 and 0021. Paragraph 0021 mentions alert messages but not abnormality alerts. Paragraph 0009 provides the following:

> In order to have efficient and economical supply chain management, the interrelationship among each buyer and the upstream and down stream suppliers requires an exchange of "current" information that permits real-time visibility into the status of the supply chain, fast identification of abnormal events and other information that permits exception management.

Yang explains that its system will allow for fast identification of abnormal events for the user. Yang is just describing an advantage of its system. But allowing a user to infer abnormal events quickly is not the same as providing an abnormality alert, and therefore, Yang fails to teach the

claimed abnormality alerts. Thus, the cited combination of references fails to teach this feature of claims 1, 6, and 21.

The Examiner refers to the claimed abnormality alerts and states that they do not add anything to the "claimed acts or steps and thus do not serve to distinguish over the prior art." Office Action at 13. This statement is incorrect. The claims are focused on an exchange of information, and type of information exchanged is critical for the claimed subject matter. Thus, the claimed subject matter is impacted significantly by the recited features, and the above-quoted statement is nothing more than an attempt to ignore features which are not taught by the cited art.

Furthermore, claim 6 recites, "assigning event elements to the product includes the secondary provider defining a first event element using a first computer system associated with the secondary provider and the primary provider modifying the first event element using a second computer system associated with the primary provider." At pages 9-12 of the Office Action, the rejection cites many places at Yang and Hagen to teach the above-recited feature, but never asserts that any of the cited portions actually teaches the feature. Instead, it appears that the rejection spends three pages of text explaining how the combination might make use of such a feature. However, the rejection fails to actually show that such feature is present in any of the references. A review of the cited passages indicates that neither Yang or Hagen teaches a secondary provider defines a first event element using its respective computer system and a primary provider modifies the first even element using its respective computer system. Thus, the combination of references does not teach the above-recited feature of claim 6.

Moving to claim 21, the cited combination of references does not teach "instructions for establishing a virtual fab with a plurality of entities, ... wherein at least one of the plurality of entities is associated with an internal process and at least one of the entities is associated with an external process." The rejection does not rely on Hagen or Arackaparambil to teach this feature, but rather, cites Yang. However, Yang does not teach this feature. On the contrary, in paragraph 0070 and FIG. 9 of Yang, the application server executes programs for performing supply chain

management, but it does not divide the processes into internal and external processes. For at least this reason, the combination of references does not teach this feature of claim 21.

Additionally, claim 21 recites, "instructions for controlling the product quality, wherein the product quality may be controlled by at least two of the plurality of entities." The rejection spends almost a page and a half citing portions of Yang, Hagen, and Arackaparambil to teach the above-recited feature. The rejection attempts to make a point that the combined subject matter could make use of such a feature. However, a review of the cited passages indicates that Yang does not teach product quality controlled by at least two entities; nor does Hagen or Arackaparambil. None of the references teaches product quality controlled by more than a single entity. Therefore, no combination of the three references teaches the above-recited feature.

Moreover, claim 21 recites, "instructions for determining a future location for the product and the associated information through the virtual fab via the enterprise control entity." The rejection cites Yang at paragraphs 0165-0167, 0085-0087, 0018, 0023, and 0072. Such cited passages teach a lot tracking system at various stages of the supply chain. However, not one of the passages teaches determining a future location. For instance, calculating estimated finished goods on the standard cycle time of each stage does not teach determining a future location. More specifically, cited passages at Yang at paragraphs 0085-0087 address estimated times and quantities, but do not disclose determining a future location. Nor does the use of dynamic data, which the rejection states is data that "can be changed during the manufacturing process." Office Action at 22. Changing data during the manufacturing process does not teach determining a future location. For at least these reasons, the cited combination of Yang, Hagen, and Arackaparambil does not teach the above-recited feature of claim 21.

As shown above, each of independent claims 1, 6, and 21 recite features that are patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of the claims be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 9-12, 14-19, 22, and 24

Dependent claims 2-5, 9-12, 14-19, 22, and 24 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 6, and 21 and therefore are deemed to be patentable over the prior art.

Conclusion

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 14-19, 21-22 and 24 is requested. A personal or telephonic interview is respectfully requested to discuss any remaining issues in an effort to expedite the allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas W. Kelton
Registration No. 54,214

Dated: March 22, 2011

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
Customer No.: 42717
Telephone: 972/739-6923
Facsimile: 214/200-0853
Client Matter No.: 2003-0527 / 24061.105
Document No.: R-273864_1.DOC

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on March 22, 2011.

Linda Ingram

Linda Ingram